

# The Daily Courant.

Monday, November 5. 1716.

London, November 5.

**T**HE Reverend Dr. Kennet, Dean of Peterborough, having in a Pamphlet intitled *A Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, &c.* made very instructive Remarks on Dr. Hickey's Collection of Papers which have been lately printed and dispersed clandestinely for promoting the Jacobite Schism; 'tis thought proper to give the Publick the following Extract of such of those Remarks as may be of most general Use.

**S**UCH is the Charity and good Nature of these new Church-Men of the Jacobite Separation, that they will not spare their own dear Brethren, if they offend them, or differ from them any wise in their singular Notions or Practice. I beg Leave to give an Instance or two of this their Brotherly Love from the Collection of Papers written by the late R. Reverend George Hickey, D. D. 8vo. 1716. in the Cases of Mr. Dodwell, Bishop Elm, and Mr. Kettlewell, three Persons who, one would think, did as well deserve the good Word of the whole Fraternity, as any Men whatever; and yet severe and strange Accounts are there given of them, not candid, and I believe not true.

Mr. Dodwell was the very Man, who upon the Principle of the Invalidity of Lay Deprivation was, in effect, the Author and first Vindicator of their Separation from us; and was more able than any one to fetch it out of the broken State of the Primitive Church, and to draw his wonted Chain of Consequences from such confused Authorities. And yet this learned Man, having some Moderation in him, and not being willing the Schism should continue after the decease of the Deprived Bishops, and therefore arguing upon that Case in View, and afterwards upon the same Case in Fact, and accordingly conforming his own Practice to it, and returning to the Communion of our Church; Dr. Hickey is out of Patience with him: I hope, Sir, (says he to Mr. Nelson) I have said enough to abate the great Deserency you have for Mr. Dodwell upon the Account of his great Learning and Piety, and pray you to consider, that if he were free from Infirmitates than he is, and his Authority greater, yet you ought not to follow his Example, when he is not in the Right, and argues so weakly as he has done in his CASE IN VIEW. Again and again, I could show you, that Mr. Dodwell in his CASE IN VIEW is contrary to himself in his former Writings, which he wrote in Defence of our Deprived Fathers. But perhaps that will be done by another Hand. You know also how much he is addicted to Nostrums, and how apt he is to raise Doctrines from single Passages out of one or two Fathers, which were never received, taught, or professed by the Catholic Church. You know also what Offence of late he hath given by his

Writings to Learned Church-Men of both Communion; and particularly, what Offence he gave to our Deprived Fathers and their Presbyters, by his PARABNESIS AD EXTEROS; where upon a new and false Hypothesis of his own making, contrary to the Accounts which all antient Writers give of the first Bishops (I mean his Hypothesis of the JERUSALEM SUPREMACY) he argues in a weak and precarious manner from Devolution of Right, as he doth in his Case in View; without telling us by what Provision or Direction of Law Ecclesiastical, the Episcopal Right of the last of the Jerusalem Bishops of our Lord's Family devolved upon the Presbyters, whom he supposed were Presidents or Pro-cathedrals of all Churches when that Succession ended. Again, there was great want of Law and Logic in Mr. Dodwell, to write in such a weak as well as fallacious Manner, p. 258.

I am not going to make an Apology for any of the Singularities of Mr. Dodwell; yet whatever was his Narrowness of Spirit, he had greater Charity than Dr. Hickey; and of all Men the Doctor should have been the last to speak such angry Things of him.

But Dr. Hickey, it seems, had still harder Things to say of Mr. Dodwell; for he must mean it of him, when he says, "I take the Freedom to tell you, that he whole great Example you follow in this Case, never would say Amen to the Prayers for King James; and since his Majesty's Death said to one of our Brethren, who will assure you of the Truth of it, that he thought we ought to pray for the Princess Anne as Queen, because she kept out a Popish Successor. It would be no Wonder to see such a Man join the other Assemblies. Now the former Things were peevish and unbrotherly, and I doubt these are very false. I had an Opportunity of knowing Mr. Dodwell as well as any Man who differed from him; I knew his Manner of Communication in Oxford several Years; I lived with him in St. Edmund Hall about the Time of the Revolution; and convers'd frequently with him in the Company of the Principal of that House, the learned Dr. Mills. And after he was deprived of his Canon Professorship, he was my Parishioner at Shorthillbrook in Berks, several Years together. Now in all that long Season of Acquaintance, I could not find out, that he never would say Amen to the Prayers for King James. Indeed after King James was in Ireland, Mr. Henry Dodwell had the less Affection for that Royal Person; because, poor Man, he found himself proscribed, and his Estate forfeited, by Popish Interest and Power in that Kingdom. But still his Principles of Regal Right and Passive Submission were the same; and by the profound Respect with which he always mentioned that unhappy Prince, I could never surmise but that he prayed for him, and that in the Daily Offices of the Liturgy among themselves. That since the Death of King James



he should be so good as to say to one of his Brethren, that he thought we ought to pray for the Princess Anne as Queen, because she kept out a Popish Successor is to me incredible, tho' I should be extremely glad to have it granted; for I hope it will be an Argument to some of his Admirers to pray for King George as King, because he much more effectually keeps out the same Popish Pretender.

The next Person not kindly or justly used by Dr. Hickey, is Bishop Ken, one of his Deprived Fathers, or in his Sense, of his Collegues and Brethren. A Man of exemplary Piety and Humility, and at first of great Charity in the Controversies arising upon the Revolution. His Doubtfulness and Fearfulness could not be easily determined. He own'd in his Letter to the Bishop of Sarum, Octob. 5, 1689, that he had prepared a Pastoral Letter upon the Supposition of altering his Judgment, and that there might have been an Inducement to him to comply: "But it seems he burnt his Paper, and adher'd to his former Opinion; but still without confusing others of a contrary Judgment, much less dividing in Communion from them. To his old Friend Dr. Hooper, now Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, who had daily and earnestly discours'd him on the Subject of Compliance with the Oath, he at last used these Expressions, — I question not, but that you, and several others have taken the Oath with as good a Conscience as my self shall refuse them; and sometimes you have almost persuaded me to comply, by the Arguments you have used; but I beg you to urge them no further; for should I be persuaded to comply, and after see Reason to repent, you would make me the most miserable Man in the World. We have heard of many more Signs and Tokens of Reluctancies and Suspences of Mind in Bishop Ken, and of Mr. Dodwell's Correspondence with him, and turning him back in his very way to London, when he was going up to submit to the Government. We have the greatest Reason to think it was Anxiety of Thought, a tremulous Conscience, and the fear of an After-Repentance, that made him chafe (as a mortified Man) the safer Side of Penality in Ease and Quiet. And yet he was then somewhat irresolv'd. I believe it will appear, that upon the Queen's Accession to the Throne he had some Thoughts of submitting, to be re-instated in his See. And when he could not get over all his Doubts and Scruples, he was again intangled in a new Question of Resigning or not Resigning. In short, he was not a Man after the Heart of Dr. Hickey, and therefore is upwards used, by him. I doubt the Bishop did not approve of the Doctor's Consecration, and purposely absented from it. The Doctor had heard such an Objection from some of the dividing Party. Says he to Mr. Nelson [Collection of Papers, p. 226.] Others take upon you to say that the Consecrations of our Bishops, and the Power thereby conferred upon them by the Synod of the Deprived Fathers, was not valid, for want of the Consent of Bishop Ken. He first proves there was no need of that one particular Person, who might have been present if he pleased; and whose positive Dissent goes for nothing. But then the Doctor adds, "It is not true that the Consecrations of our Bishops wanted Bishop Ken's Consent, which he gave before in a Letter which he wrote on purpose to the Bishop of Ely, one of the Consecrators; and afterwards when he met some of the Consecrated, gave him his Congratulation in these or the like Words, that tho' he was not present in Person at his Consecration, yet he was present at it in Spirit: And since when some of our Communion told him they were afraid no Provision was made for the Church, he, to give them Satisfaction, assur'd them, that Provision was made by new Consecrations."

If all this be true, I am sure it is contrary to what the Writer of the Life of Bishop Ken, his Nephew and Executor, assisted by his Chaplain

Dr. Thomas Chyney, has affirmed to us, [Life of Bishop Ken, p. 26.] That his Opinion was not agreeable to such of the Nonjurors, who were for continuing a Separation, by private Consecrations among themselves, may (should there be any good Occasion) best be known by his Answers to Letters, written from Men of Learning, who conversed with him on that Subject, and which he let behind him. And indeed had his Lordship any way countenanced such Consecrations, as Dr. Hickey confesses must be clandestine because they are treasonable by our Laws, he would have hardly told the Privy Council in the Beginning of 1696, "That had he gone into the Country to his Retirement in an obscure Village, where he lived above the Suspicion of giving any the least Umbrage to the Government. [Account of his Examination before the Privy Council, subscribed by his own Hand, April 28, 1696.]

But that which angered Dr. Hickey, was Bishop Ken's deserting of that Cause by a voluntary Resignation of his See. Says the Doctor, p. 227. "The strange Humour of resigning took him. I say the strange Humour; First, Because it was not in his Power so much as to make a Cession without the Consent of his Collegues, much less without their Consent to resign to any particular Person; because by the Nature of the Episcopal College, as well as the Canons of the Church, they were to elect and admit into his vacant See. Secondly, Because he pretended to resign, to heal the Schism in his Diocese; a Reason, which if good, should have obliged him to have resigned at first, and not to have kept his Diocese Twelve Years or more in Schism. Thirdly, I think it a strange Humour, because he resigned, as much as in him lay, to one who neither could nor durst own himself for his next Successor, but is obliged to own himself next Successor to the Intruder Dr. Kidder; and also because he resigns to one with whom he does not communicate upon the account of the immoral Prayers, whereby the Bishop to whom he resign'd effectually teaches the Flock which he resign'd to him, the damnable Doctrine of Resistance and Deposing Sovereign Princes, and leads them into a fatal Error of taking Right for Wrong, and Wrong for Right." So that Bishop Ken, in the Opinion of his Brother Hickey, is not only a Humorist but a Separatist, and a Promoter of Heresy and Rebellion.

Mr. Kettlewell was the third Man I mentioned, who has not met with kind Usage from his Brethren of the Separation with him. Mr. Kettlewell was a very serious and austere Man, made for a Confessor and Sufferer in any Cause which he should think to be good. He refused the Oath, and at last would not Communicate with those that took them. But he likewise falling short in the Perfection of Dr. Hickey's Principles, he is marked out for a sort of Heretical Pravity in him, and stands stigmatized to be read with Caution, like an unorthodox Writer in an expurgatory Index. [See the last Page of the Collection of Papers.] The Reader is desired to take Notice, that in the latter End of Mr. Kettlewell's Christian Communion, the worthy Author, out of his extraordinary Mildness and good Nature, has made some Allowances which are not agreeable with the true Notion of Schism, or with the Principles of Church Communion, nor indeed consistent with the other Part of his Book. — Therefore let every Reader of that Book take Care, that he be not at all biased, either by Mr. Kettlewell's Authority, or by any worldly Interest.

From these Passages of the Differences and Feuds among those Fathers and Brethren, and of the censorious and bitter Spirit of Dr. Hickey in his Reflections on some of them; I infer, that when they





they had separated from us, they were as far from agreeing with one another, or speaking charitably of one another. They loved to call themselves *the Few*, and *the faithful Few*; and yet were too many to come to any unity of Judgment or Affection; they divided and subdivided in their own little Flock, even Pastor against Pastor: I question whether Dr. *Hicks* had any one of his *Peculium* that could go in entirely to his whole Scheme of the Separation.

And indeed the Principles upon which they formed their Schism from the established Church, were by no Means uniform and common; but almost every one of the Builders laid his own distinct Foundation. Dr. *Hicks* at first upon the *Heresies* of Resistance and the Deposing Power brought in at the Revolution. Mr. *Kettlewell* upon the new Oath, and new Allegiance required upon the Settlement of the Crown. Mr. *Dodwell* upon the Invalidity of Lay Deprivation by Act of Parliament. Others upon the Immorality of the publick Prayers for the Powers in Being, whom they thought Usurpers. And if I understood Bishop *Ken* in a Conversation with his Lordship at Mr. *Cherry's*, he put it chiefly upon what he call'd the Sacrilege of taking away Episcopacy in Scotland. It was that Multiplicity of Notions that made them vary in their Practice. They boasted of six or seven Deprived Bishops; and what if there were four or five such different Ways of Behaviour among them, as could not possibly proceed from the same Principle, or any concerted Measures? Archbishop *Sancroft* went farther toward the Revolution, and was more passive after it, than any of his Brethren. The Bishop of *Chichester*, Dr. *Lake*, upon his Death-Bed declared for the Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience, Aug. 27. 1689. but tho' under Suspension, and expecting Deprivation, he had not yet thought of a Separation; he communicated with them who had not then separated from our Congregations. The Bishop of *Gloucester*, Dr. *Purton*, though deprived of his See, was many Years after posses'd of a Parochial Cure, wherein if he did not officiate, he generally joined with the People, and when he cared no longer to hold the Living, he obtained it from her Majesty Queen *Ann*, for one whom he recommended to her; though the Grant, I believe, was afterwards revoked by the Courage of Bishop *Fowler*. A fourth of their Fathers took another Turn, the Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, Dr. *Ken*, who suffered the Schism during the Life of Bishop *Kidder*, and yet upon the Translation of Bishop *Hopper* resigned to him to heal the Schism. So as we can find but three at most of the seven who lived to be at Harmony with one another, in pitching upon Dr. *Hicks* as the first Person to be admitted into the Episcopal College; and he was accordingly consecrated by Dr. *Turner*, Dr. *Watts*, and Dr. *Lloyd*, the deprived Bishops of *Ely*, *Exeter*, and *Norwich*.

Nay, as their Bishops, so their Clergy and their People, were of very different Sentiments about what they were to do, or not to do, toward continuing or ending their Separation. When the large Collection of Letters to and from Mr. *Dodwell*, once carefully preserved by Mr. *Cherry*, comes to publick View, that Distraction among them will appear to have been very grievous. Dr. *Hicks's* Letter to Mr. *Nelson*, does sufficiently shew, that it was with them as with the *Donatists* and *Novatians*, and most other of the old Schismatics; they who first divided had soon a Subdivision made from them, and so were crumbling till they came to Nothing. I think one of the severest Books against Dr. *Hicks*, is that of the *Character of a Primitive Bishop*, written by one whom he then thought to be one of the Faithful, if not one of their separate Communion: I am not willing to transcribe the Character he

there gives of Dr. *Hicks*, but I find he knew him perfectly well. Even the Doctor himself was not always of one Mind in those Matters: Before his Mock Consecration to *Thetford*, he thought there was no Necessity of any new Consecrations to preserve the Being of their Church; because upon the Death of the last deprived Bishops, there would be a Devolution of Power to the chief Presbyters, who might be a Principle of Unity, till they could hereafter get Bishops to them from some Foreign Church; or, as he states his Opinion, with Reference to *Ireland*, 'That upon Supposition all the Protestant Bishops should die in a long Popish Reign, it would be the Duty of the Irish Protestant People to adhere to their faithful Presbyters, who in such a Vacancy would be their Spiritual Guides, Guardians, Fathers, Pastors, and Principles of Unity to them, till they could procure one or more Bishops, which would be their Duty by all Means and Endeavours, to do as soon as possibly they could.' Others again would have had no new Consecrations in *England*, but would have adhered to the Irish Bishop of *Kilmore*, then deprived and resident in *England*. So Dr. *Hicks* acknowledges, 'Some of our few deserting Brethren then thought the Bishop of *Kilmore*, as a Catholic Bishop, qualify'd to keep up our Communion, and would not have left us if he would have taken the Pastoral Care of us, and been a Principle of Unity to us.' But it seems he would take no Care of them, and they, poor Men, took as little of him: He was reduced to great Wants before he died; he represented his Wants to the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*; he complain'd, that his Friends were not kind to him: His Grace sent him his Bounty from Time to Time, and he was very thankful for being so enabled to pay some Debts, and to lay in some Provisions.

How divided they were among themselves, does farther appear, from [Collect. of Papers, pag. 174.] A Letter written to the Reverend Dr. GEORGE HICKES, containing some Objections against his Letter to Mr. NELSON, written by one of that Party, who wants to have several Things cleared up, has this and that Objection, would fain be better satisfied, &c. And, I suppose, the Answer there given would not pass without a great many more Queries upon it.

Some of them who own'd Resistance to be a *Heresie*, would not own the Validity of Lay Deprivations to be a *Heresie*, because indeed it was never condemn'd by the ancient Church as a *HERESIE*. One would think a good Reason to those who were reducing all Things to the exact Standard of the Primitive Church. Yet others maintained it for express and fundamental *Heresie*: And a third Sort would bring it off with a Distinction, that it was not a *Speculative Heresie* contrary to the *Creeds* of Religion; but yet it was one of the *Practical Heresies*, as being contrary to the *Agenda* of Religion. Hence again, some were very fond of asserting, that our Bishops now in Possession of all the Sees in *England*, are *Hereticks*, like as the *Donatists* and *Novatians*, were *Hereticks* as well as *Schismatics*. But others were a little more moderate, and thought our Bishops, though in the Schism, were not proved guilty of *Heresy*. Some were more concerned for the *Doctrines*, than for the Schism; and said, the deprived Bishops would have quitted their Personal Rights, provided they could have secured the *Doctrines* of Passive Obedience, and the Independence of the Church. Others, or even the same Men, said afterwards, 'No, the deprived Bishops could not have quitted their Personal Rights, till the Intruders had confess'd themselves invalidly elected and consecrated in to their Sees.'

Some



Some were absolutely forbidding their People to come to our Churches, because of our *immoral* Prayers, as they called them; a Prayers for King George and his Royal Family. Others thought they might hear those Prayers read, and yet not join in them, and the Duty of joining in the good Prayers, might oblige them to be present at those which were not good.

There is a *Distinction* fracted, that is not so right in itself, nor will it convince the new Schismatics to whom it condescends; namely, the wide Difference between the Schism of Co-ordination, and the Schism of Subordination; and that Dr. Compton, the Bishop of London's Acknowledgment of Intruders into neighbouring Sees, was but a Schism of Co-ordination in respect to those his equal Collegues, and could not justify a Schism of Subordination, which must have followed, if the Clergy and People of London Diocess had thereupon separated from Bishop Compton, or his present Successor.

Now, I do not think that Bishop Compton was guilty of any Manner of Schism, but if he were, he must be guilty of a Schism of Subordination, and not of Co-ordination only. No, says the Distinguisht, I need not observe to the Non-Jacobs, that all Bishops are of the same Order and Dignity. Yes, but they tell us again, that tho' one Bishop is not subordinate to another single Bishop, yet he is still subordinate to the College of Bishops; which true College were the deprived Bishops; and that Bishop Compton broke that Unity and Order to which he ought to have been subject. Nay, and they tell us, that by our Constitution, which had prevailed likewise very early in the Primitive Church, Bishop Compton was in a Provincial Capacity as well as in a Diocesan, subordinate as a Suffragan to Archbishop Sancroft; and that he broke through that Subordination, even by a Breach of his Oath of Canonical Obedience to his Primate and Metropolitan; and farther still, by assisting and presiding in the Consecration of a new Archbishop, Usurper and Intruder, as they call him: Which certainly makes the Distinction in that Case to be put into the Mouths of the Jacobites, rather than to be taken from 'em. I have myself heard them complain of Bishop Compton as the Ring Leader of the Schism.

Dr. Hickey does abundantly imply, nay affirm, that Bishop Compton, by leaving his Primate and consecrating another into that Metropolitan See, was a Principal in the Guilt of the Schism of Subordination. For, speaking of those who filled up the Sees of the deprived Bishops, says he, 'their Electors and Consecrators are *Autiores & Duces Schismatis*, Authors and Architects of the Schism, and in the same Degree of Guilt with them that are Breakers of the sacred Order of Co-ordination and SUBORDINATION. [Collect. of Papers, pag. 96.] Again, 'None of the deprived Bishops Sees were really vacant, no Person was nominated to them by the KING, (i. e. King James) nor were the Intruders consecrated by the Metropolitan, (Archbishop Sancroft) but without, nay against his Consent, though he was still Living, and their Lawful Primate. [Ib. pag. 314.]

These Things might be represented more at large, and I think if we must adapt our Arguments to the Prejudice of those People, by gracious Concessions to them, (a way that seldom prevails,) this would be a fair way of expostulating with them, Why they keep up a Schism that their Leaders could not agreed upon? And why do they boast of the Union of a true Church, when so many were the Windings and Turnings of the Guides in that Way? This honest Way, if any Thing, might serve to convince their Followers, that they can hardly be in a right Way, since they know not whence they come, or whither they are going. They may, for a short Time, agree as a Political

Faction; but as a *Spiritual Society*, they were at first, and must be ever in Confusion.

In reading the *Collection of Papers* written by Dr. Hickey, one is shock'd at his distorted Use of Holy Scriptures; his fanciful Inventions about the Nature and State of the first Evangelical Churches; his insisting absolutely on the Testimonies of Fathers in Matters of Discipline and outward Practice, wherein they must needs run backward and forward, as the Course of Times and Constitution of Countries might require; his exalted Notions of the Kingdom of the Church, the Thrones of Royal Prigists, Viceregents of the eternal Melchisedeck, Spiritual Principalities, and other assumed Titles of Sovereignty, beyond Popery, beyond any Enthusiasm but that of the fifth Monarchy Men, who were setting up King Jesus upon Earth; his arrainging our whole Constitution, Ecclesiastical and Civil, as upon a wrong Bottom from the very first Foundations of it, upon many false Maxims extremely hurtful to the Church, and detrimental to the Christian Religion, received for Law and Truth. [Coll. of Pap. p. 75, &c.] His Painting our Reformation blacker than Sanders and the Jesuits could ever represent it, and making a Separation or Schism from it necessary upon those Principles, as much at the Beginning of Queen Elizabeth, as at the Beginning of King William. His Modelling such an Independent Church, and yet making the Christian Magistrate so much depending on it, that no Christian Prince or State would protect such a Church; or if they did, they must be in a worse Condition, as to Temporals, than the Heathen Emperours were, in and after the Apostles Time. His bringing the Clergy of our Church into the utmost Contempt and Incapacity; they can perform no valid Acts of Priesthood, their very Prayers are Sin, their Sacraments are no Sacraments, their Absolutions are null, and of no force, God ratifies nothing in Heaven which they do in his Name upon Earth, they and all that adhere to them are out of the Church, they can claim no Benefits of God's Promises; no, nor of his assisting Grace, nor of Remission of Sins through the Merits of Christ's Blood. Nay, though they should dye Martyrs in their Schism, their Martyrdom would not be accepted; if they could dye Martyrs more than once, they could not make amends for their Sin with their Blood. [Ib. p. 32, &c.] We have seen many terrible Forms of solemn Cursing in the Church of Rome, but never any Thunder like this, never any striking so deep to the Pit of Hell. His shewing many other Instances of his Good-Will to us of the inferior Clergy; one Instance especially that we cannot approve, his shutting us all out of the Convocation House; for we have forgot, it seems, what a perfect Synod it, which is a Synod of the Provincial Bishops, or the Majority of them under the Metropolitan, in which he is personally, or by Proxy present: Such is a Synod only, so that we have been disputing about the Privileges of our House to a fair Purpose, when, as soon as the Church was out of Danger, we were all to be turned out of Doors. He has a great many other Positions and Consequences, that all the Lovers of Truth and Charity must think to be absurd and dreadful.

I will make one Observation more, which is, that in other Schisms and Divisions we might hope for some end of them, without a Necessity of submitting to such Conditions as that of Unchurching the Established Church of England, and that likewise of transferring the Crown to another Head and Family: But these two are the express Conditions, the very Preliminaries insisted on by these Jacobite Schismatics, before they can treat with us; we must agree with them in the first Place to the turning out all our Archbishops and Bishops, and if they could hope to be restored, it must be effectually done when Time serves, by their desiring or accepting from the Crown new Nominations to their Bishopricks, [Collection of Papers,

not brought